



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,159	01/12/2004	Max F. Morris	03-5804	1238
7590 08/26/2005			EXAMINER	
William M. Hobby, III 157 E. New England Avenue, #375 Winter Park, FL 32789			FERNSTROM, KURT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
DATE MAILED: 08/26/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/755,159

Applicant(s)

MORRIS, MAX F.

Examiner

Kurt Fernstrom

Art Unit

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 and 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 1 as amended recites that **each** printed line has scan words and non-scan words (emphasis added). However, it appears from the Figure and the specification that some lines contain only scan words (e.g. the bottom four lines in the left column in Figure 1) and some lines contain only non-scan words (e.g. the bottom two lines in the right column).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris (4,643,450) in view of Mossman. Morris discloses in the Figure and in the specification a speed reading system comprising a plurality of printed sheets, each sheet having a vertically extending scan bar 10, printed lines of indicia extending perpendicular to the scan bar, where selected grouped scan words are in a bold font to distinguish from non-scan words, a plurality of scan line indicators 15 corresponding to the scan words, and a second scan bar 16 which is parallel to the first scan bar and on the other side of the scan line indicators. Morris fails to disclose that the scan words are presented in a larger type. However, it is well known to place words in a larger font to emphasize those words within a group of words. Mossman discloses one example in column 2, lines 10-12, where a word temporarily increases in size to draw a reader's attention to that word. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art to modify the device of Morris by providing the scan words in a larger font for the purpose of providing an additional visual emphasis to the words. With respect to the language pertaining to the length of each printed line, the precise length of each scan line is not explicitly disclosed by Morris, but the scan lines of Morris do appear to be of similar length to those of the present invention. With respect to the limitations pertaining to the larger type used for scan words, the recited limitation is an obvious variation on the teachings of the prior art. One of ordinary skill would understand that a larger increase in size would result in a larger emphasis on the scan word. With respect to claim 2, each scan line indicator of Morris is a solid color square.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on June 21, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. While the prior Morris patent does not disclose the precise length of each scan line recited in the claims (4 cm), the Figure appears to fall within this range. Also, Morris describes the use of short lines throughout the specification (see col. 1, lines 21-24 and col. 3, lines 1-7). This limitation is suggested by the prior patent. Morris also discloses that the scan words are in a different type font, as the boldfacing and coloring amount to different type fonts as described throughout the specification.

With respect to the combination of Morris with Mossman. It is understood that the two references are directed to two slightly different purposes (speed reading versus reading aloud). However, the two inventions are similar in that they involve emphasizing selected words to draw a reader's attention to those particular words. Boldface and different colored fonts are explicitly disclosed by the previous Morris patent, but other ways of emphasizing words in relation to other words are well known. One such way is increasing the size of selected words, which is disclosed by Mossman. Using a larger type font is simply an obvious variation on the methods of emphasis disclosed by Morris, and does not

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kurt Fernstrom whose telephone number is (571) 272-4422. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jessica Harrison can be reached on (571) 272-4449. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KF  
August 22, 2005



**KURT FERNSTROM**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**